

## EN BANC

[ G.R. NO. 173787, April 23, 2007 ]

**THE PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE, VS.  
MARIO GUILLERMO Y ESTEBAN, ACCUSED-APPELLANT.**

### D E C I S I O N

**GARCIA, J.:**

For automatic review is the Decision<sup>[1]</sup> dated April 6, 2006 of the Court of Appeals (CA) in *CA-G.R. CR-H.C. No. 00103*, which dismissed appellant's appeal from and affirmed the earlier decision<sup>[2]</sup> of the Regional Trial Court (RTC) of Camiling, Tarlac, Branch 68, in its Criminal Cases No. 2001-129 and 2001-130, finding appellant Mario Guillermo y Esteban guilty beyond reasonable doubt of the crime of **Incestuous Rape** on two (2) counts and sentencing him to suffer the extreme penalty of death for each count.

Pursuant to our pronouncement in *People v. Mateo*,<sup>[3]</sup> which modified the provisions of the Rules of Court insofar as they provide for direct appeals from the RTC to this Court in cases where the penalty imposed is death, *reclusion perpetua* or life imprisonment, this case was earlier<sup>[4]</sup> referred to the CA for appropriate action and disposition, whereat it was docketed as *CA-G.R. CR-H.C. No. 00103*.

In line with our decision in *People v. Cabalquinto*,<sup>[5]</sup> the real name of the rape victim in this case is withheld. Instead, fictitious initials are used to represent her. Also, the personal circumstances of the victim or any other information tending to establish or compromise her identity, as well as those of her immediate family or household members, is not disclosed in this decision.

The facts:

In the court of origin, Mario Guillermo y Esteban was accused of incestuous rape on two (2) counts under two separate Informations<sup>[6]</sup> worded as follows:

**Criminal Case No. 2001-129:**

That on or about November 18, 2000 at around 11:00 o'clock in the evening at Brgy. Sawat, Municipality of Camiling, Province of Tarlac, Philippines and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the above-named accused being the father of 14 year old XXX, by means of force, threats and intimidation did then and there willfully, unlawfully and feloniously have sexual intercourse against her (sic) daughter XXX, against the latter's will and consent.

CONTRARY TO LAW.

**Criminal Case No. 2001-130:**

That on or about April 29, 2001, at around 2:00 o'clock in the morning at Brgy. Sawat, Municipality of Camiling, Province of Tarlac, Philippines and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the above-named accused being the father of 14 year old XXX, by means of force, threats and intimidation did then and there willfully, unlawfully and feloniously have sexual intercourse against her (sic) daughter XXX, against the latter's will and consent.

CONTRARY TO LAW.

Arraigned on March 12, 2002, appellant, as accused below, assisted by counsel, pleaded "Not Guilty" to both charges. Thereafter, a joint trial on the merits ensued, in the course of which the prosecution presented the oral testimonies of the victim XXX, of the victim's mother and of Dr. Mercedes Gapultos, a doctor from the Camiling Emergency Hospital where XXX was brought for examination.

The People's version of the incidents is succinctly summarized by the Office of the Solicitor General (OSG) in its Appellee's Brief<sup>[7]</sup> as follows:

On November 18, 2000, at about 11:00 in the evening, while private complainant XXX and her three (3) sisters are sleeping, XXX suddenly woke up feeling that someone removed her panty and that someone was already on top of her, whom she later recognized as her father herein appellant. She also felt appellant insert his organ in her organ.

When she was awakened, appellant immediately stood up and put on his underwear and short pants. At the same time, XXX also saw appellant laughing at her.

On April 3, 2001, at around 2:00 in the morning, XXX woke up and found out that her short pants were down and her sex organ was wet. Later in the morning of the same day, when they were about to have breakfast, appellant told XXX that he inserted his penis in her organ. When confronted, appellant merely told her that she would not get pregnant.

On the other hand, the defense's version is hinged mainly on appellant's denial. To quote from his own (appellant's) brief:

MARIO GUILLERMO denied that he ever committed the accusations leveled against him by his daughter. He could only surmise that her mother coached his daughter on what to say.

He recalled that on November 18, 2000 at around 11 o'clock in the evening, as he was trying to sleep inside their bedroom, his daughter, the herein complainant, suddenly got up from bed. It is the habit of the complainant to walk while still asleep. She usually walks whenever she sleeps even during her afternoon nap. He remembered also that his daughter attended a seminar but returned only after three (3) days. He scolded and spanked her every time she failed to come home on the same day.

Significantly, appellant made no attempt to dispute the allegations regarding the April 29, 2001 rape incident in his appellant's brief, other than asserting that XXX did not see appellant inserting his penis in her vagina.

On February 5, 2004, the trial court came out with its decision<sup>[8]</sup> convicting appellant of incestuous rape on two (2) counts and sentencing him as follows:

WHEREFORE, in view of the foregoing, accused MARIO GUILLERMO y ESTEBAN is hereby found GUILTY beyond reasonable doubt of the crime of Rape, two (2) counts under Article 266-A of the Revised Penal Code, as amended, and is hereby sentenced to suffer the supreme penalty of DEATH for each crime of Rape, and, further, to pay the private complainant the amount of P75,000.00 by way of civil indemnity *ex delicto* in each of the two (2) cases, the amount of P50,000.00 by way of moral damages, likewise, in each of the two (2) cases, and the amount of P50,000.00 by way of exemplary damages, with costs.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

As stated at the onset hereof, the Court, in its Resolution<sup>[9]</sup> of August 24, 2004, and pursuant to its ruling in *People v. Mateo*,<sup>[10]</sup> referred the case and its records to the CA for appropriate action and disposition.

In turn, in its decision<sup>[11]</sup> of April 6, 2006, the CA affirmed that of the trial court. Dispositively, the CA decision reads:

UPON THE VIEW WE TAKE OF THIS CASE, THUS, the appealed Decision dated February 5, 2004 of the Regional Trial Court of Camiling, Tarlac, Branch 68, in Criminal Cases Nos. 2001-129 and 2001-130, finding the accused-appellant MARIO GUILLERMO Y ESTEBAN guilty beyond reasonable doubt of two counts of qualified rape and sentencing him in each case to suffer the supreme penalty of death and to pay his daughter-victim, XXX, the amounts of P75,000.00 as civil indemnity, P50,000.00 as moral damages, and P25,000.00 as exemplary damages is AFFIRMED.

Should no motions for reconsideration be filed in these cases by the accused-appellant within the allowable reglementary period, or after the lapse thereof, let the entire records of this case be forwarded to the Honorable Supreme Court for appropriate action thereon.

SO ORDERED.

In its Resolution of September 19, 2006, the Court resolved to accept the case and required the parties to submit their respective supplemental briefs.

In separate *Manifestations* (In lieu of a Supplemental Brief) respectively dated October 17, 2006 and November 8, 2006, appellant, through the Public Attorney's Office, and appellee *People*, through the Office of the Solicitor General, informed the Court that they were no longer filing supplemental briefs and were merely adopting their appellant's and appellee's briefs before the CA as their supplemental briefs.

In his Appellant's Brief<sup>[12]</sup> before the CA, appellant assigns the following errors:

I

THE TRIAL COURT GRAVELY ERRED IN FAILING TO CONSIDER THAT THE FACT OF CARNAL KNOWLEDGE, WHICH IS A VITAL ELEMENT OF THE CRIME OF RAPE, WAS NOT PROVEN WITH CERTAINTY.

II

ASSUMING THAT THE ACCUSED-APPELLANT IS GUILTY OF THE CRIME CHARGED, THE COURT A QUO GRAVELY ERRED IN IMPOSING THE SUPREME PENALTY OF DEATH DESPITE THE FAILURE OF THE PROSECUTION TO PROVE THE REAL AGE OF THE COMPLAINANT.

The appeal must fail.

Appellant claims that the prosecution failed to present concrete evidence to prove that he had sexual intercourse with his own daughter.

In an effort to exculpate himself, appellant imputes ill motive on the part of his daughter XXX in charging him with rape. He claims that his daughter harbored ill-feelings against him whenever he scolded or spanked her every time she came home late at night or when she failed to come home for three (3) days after asking permission from him to attend a seminar.

Contrary to appellant's assertions, XXX testified that although she harbored ill-feelings against her father, such ill-feelings easily came to pass. Thus:

PROS. GUARDIANO:

xxx

Q Miss witness, earlier when counsel asked you about scolding, you had an ill feeling about your father, what is the reason?

A I had an ill feeling Sir but after a while that feeling passed.

Q By reason of the scolding?

A Yes, Sir I had ill feeling for a moment but it will pass.<sup>[13]</sup>

The imputation of ill motive on the part of the victim XXX against appellant hardly merits consideration. The alleged ill-feelings harbored by XXX against her father are too flimsy to justify the filing of charges punishable by death. The acts imputed against the appellant -- incestuous rapes -- are not ordinary criminal offenses that can be hurled with facility. In relating her experiences in public, not only the victim, but her entire family as well, had to go through the humiliation of a trial. Surely,

only the genuine desire to seek justice impelled XXX to come out in the open and reveal her unfortunate fate in the hands of her own father.<sup>[14]</sup>

To be sure, XXX was duly informed of the dire consequences of the charges she filed against her father. When asked in open court, she nonetheless answered in the following manner:

ATTY. JOAQUIN:

Q Are you aware Miss witness that if your father will be found guilty of two (2) counts of rape, he will be penalized with death by lethal injection?

A Yes, Sir.

Q And you want your father to be killed by lethal injection?

A Yes, Sir.

XXX

PROS. GUARDIANO:

Q Miss witness, earlier in the questions of the defense counsel, you stated that, if there is a possibility that your father is convicted he will die with electrocution or lethal injection, and you said "yes." If your father will ask forgiveness from you, can you forgive him?

A No, Sir.<sup>[15]</sup>

Indeed, XXX was unwavering in her account that she was repeatedly raped by her own father:

XXX XXX XXX

Q: Now Miss witness, what about April 3, 2001 around 2:00 o'clock at Sawat, Camiling, Tarlac, do you remember any incident that transpired on that day and time?

A: Yes, Sir.

Q: What was that incident?

A: When I woke up I noticed that my short pants were down, Sir.

Q: And what else did you notice?

A: When we were about to take our breakfast my father told me that he inserted his penis on me and I told him, "aren't you not afraid of what you are doing and it is not